——1982. The enigma of the Central American herpetofauna: dispersal or vicariance? *Ann. Missouri Bot. Gard. 69*, pp. 464–547.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED CONSERVATION OF TEIIDAE GRAY, 1827. Z.N.(S.)1920

(see vol. 38, pp. 194–196; vol. 39, pp. 157–158)

By Andrew Stimson (*British Museum (Natural History), London*)

The family-group name TEIIDAE is so well entrenched in the herpetological literature that there can be no doubt that the use of the plenary powers to conserve it is justified. I agree with Smith, Smith & Chiszar (vol. 39, pp. 157–158) that those powers need not be used in relation to the unavailable TUPINAMBIDAE and support their use to give TEIIDAE precedence over AMEIVIDAE.

There are, however, a couple of errors in Presch's original proposal that should be corrected. He states that the type species of *Teius* Merrem, 1820 is *Lacerta teyou* Daudin, 1802, by monotypy, and that that of *Tupinambis* Daudin, 1802 is *Lacerta teguixin* Linnaeus, 1758, also by monotypy. Since both genera originally included several nominal species neither type species can be fixed by monotypy.

Teius Merrem was based on seven species regarded as valid: viz: *Teius viridis* sp. nov. (with *Lacerta teyou* Daudin, 1802 in synonymy); *L. lemniscata* Linnaeus; *L. ameiva* Linnaeus; '*L. monitor* Bonnat.', i.e. *Tupinambis monitor* Daudin; *Teius cyaneus* sp. nov.; *L. bicarinata* Linnaeus; and *Teius crocodilinus* sp. nov. No type species was designated in the original description. In their checklist of South American lizards, Burt & Burt (1933, p. 76) gave *viridis* as the type species of *Teius,* all the other originally included species having been earlier placed in other genera. *Teius viridis* is without doubt a junior synonym of *Teius teyou* (Daudin), the only species currently recognised in this genus. Thus, while the biological type species is *Teius teyou* (Daudin) and that is the valid name for that species, the nominal type species should be cited as *Teius viridis* Merrem, 1820, p. 60, by subsequent designation by Burt & Burt, 1933, p. 76.

In the genus *Tupinambis* Daudin a similar situation exists. The 12 originally included species were: *Tupinambis monitor* sp. nov.; *T. elegans* sp. nov.; *T. cepedianus* sp. nov.; *T. indicus* sp. nov.; *T. maculatus* sp. nov.; *Lacerta nilotica* Linnaeus; *T. stellatus* sp. nov.; *T. bengalensis* sp. nov.; *T. albigularis* sp. nov.; *T. variegatus* sp. nov.; *Lacerta exanthematica* Bosc.; and *T. lacertina* sp. nov. The first-mentioned of these, *T. monitor,* contained among its cited synonyms *Temapara tupinambis* Ray, 1693, p. 265. Thus the type species of *Tupinambis* Daudin, 1802, p. 5 is *Tupinambis monitor* Daudin, 1802, p. 20, by absolute tautonymy through *Temapara tupinambis* Ray. This is the only one of the originally included species remaining in the genus. *T. monitor* is generally regarded as a synonym of *T. teguixin* (Linnaeus) sensu Boulenger (1885, p. 335), i.e. *T. rufescens* Günther sensu Presch (1973, p. 743) although Presch (p. 741) placed it in the synonymy of *T. teguixin* sensu Presch, i.e. *T. nigropunctatus*

Spix sensu Boulenger (1885, p. 337). Although the type specimen(s) appears to be lost (Guibé, 1954), it is clear that Daudin's concept of *T. monitor* was a broad one. He cites several Seba and Merian plates that between them depict examples of both *T. teguixin* (sensu Boulenger) and *T. nigropunctatus*. Thus, until a lectotype or neotype is designated, *T. monitor* should be regarded as a composite. This does not prevent this nominal species adequately serving as the type of the genus. The two component species are closely related and no worker has ever suggested, or is likely to suggest, that they do not belong to the same genus-group taxon.

REFERENCES

BURT, C. E. & BURT, M. D. 1933. A preliminary checklist of the lizards of South America. *Trans. Acad. Sci. St Louis*, vol. 28, pp. 1–104.

GUIBE, J. 1954. *Catalogue des types de lézards du Muséum national d'Histoire Naturelle*. 119 pp. (Paris).

PRESCH, W. 1973. A review of the tegus, lizard genus *Tupinambis* (Sauria: Teiidae) from South America. *Copeia*, 1973, pp. 740–746.

RAY, J. 1693. *Synopsis methodica animalium quadrupedum et serpentini generis*, 336 pp. (London).

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED CONSERVATION OF *DENDROBATES* WAGLER, 1830 AND DENDROBATIDAE COPE, 1865. Z.N.(S.)1930

(see vol. 39, pp. 264–278)

(1) By L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Postbus 9517, 2300 RA Leiden, Netherlands*)

I do not agree with M. Dubois that *Dendrobates* is a replacement name for *Hylaplesia* merely because *Hylaplesia* was cited in the synonymy of *Dendrobates* when the latter was established. Wagler nowhere stated that he intended to replace the name *Hylaplesia*, neither did he say that *Dendrobates* covered all of *Hylaplesia*. Actually he said that he knew of two species of *Hylaplesia*. An example of an often-used kind of synonymy in a newly established name is (a fictitious case): '*Macrobrachium* nov. gen. (=*Palaemon* Fabricius, 1798; *Astacus* Fabricius, 1775; *Cancer* Linnaeus, 1758)'. The author of the new name only wants to indicate that the species that he brings into the new genus were placed by Linnaeus, 1758, in *Cancer*, by Fabricius, 1775, in *Astacus*, and later removed to his genus *Palaemon* (1798). This cannot be taken to mean that *Macrobrachium* is intended as a replacement name for the other three.

Another example: take a genus *A-us* Jones, 1850, type species *A-us albus* Jones, 1850, by monotypy, to which *A-us niger* Smith, 1875 and *A-us ruber* Baker, 1900 are later referred. If I discover that *A-us* Jones, 1850 is preoccupied by *A-us* Carpenter, 1800, I may erect a new genus *B-us* with the same three species but designate *ruber* Baker as the type species with *A-us* Jones non Carpenter in synonymy. *B-us* is then not a new replacement name (*nomen novum*) for *A-us* Jones because its genus has a different type species.